DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 324 FL 012 333

AUTHOR Hauptman, Philip C.
TITLE A Comparison of First and Second Language Reading Strategies among English-Speaking University Students.
INSTITUTION Utrecht State Univ., The Netherlands.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 30p.; In its Interlanguage Studies Bulletin, Utrecht, Volume 4, Number 2, p173-201, Apr 1979. Paper presented at the Colloque international sur l'acquisition d'une langue etrangere: perspectives de recherche (Paris, France, April 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cloze Procedure; Context Clues; *Decoding (Reading); Error Analysis (Language); Higher Education; Language Research; *Native Language Instruction; *Reading Skills; *Second Language Learning; Semantics; Structural Analysis (Linguistics); Syntax; Word Recognition

ABSTRACT

In an attempt to answer some of the questions concerning the roles of syntactic vs. semantic cues and the similarities and/or differences between the first (L1) and second (L2) language reading strategies, a pilot study was conducted with 47 English-speaking students enrolled in French as a second language classes at a bilingual, English-French university. The purpose of the study was two-fold: (1) to investigate the use of L2 cues at various proficiency levels, and (2) to compare L1 and L2 reading strategies. The cloze procedure was used to elicit information. Two groups of students were on an intermediate proficiency level in French, and a third group of students were at a more advanced level. Two groups received French cloze tests; students in the third group received one French and one English cloze test of different passages. Syntactic errors, semantic errors, syntactic/semantic errors, and blanks were tabulated for each group. Three predominant unsuccessful strategies seemed to emerge: (1) reluctance to take chances, (2) failure to notice global cues, and (3) failure to notice local cues. The conclusions emerging from the study deal with the validity of cloze tests as an instrument for measuring and studying reading strategies in both first and second language, and a number of tendencies in reading proficiency in both first and second languages. (AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Interlanguage Studies Bulletin - Utrecht v4n2 Autumn 1979

"A COMPARISON OF FIRST AND SECOND LANGUAGE READING STRATEGIES AMONG ENGLISH-SPEAKING UNIVERSITY STUDENTS"*

Philip C. Hauptman
University of Ottawa

ED207324

FL 012 333

1.0 Background

1.1 Reading Theory and Research

The development of theories of linguistics, psychology, and psycholinguistics has had a direct influence on ideas concerning many aspects of language acquisition in both native language (L1) and second language (L2). Changes in ideas of how reading is acquired in L1 and L2 have likewise been observed over the past 30-50 years. Behaviourism in psychology and structuralism in linguistics viewed the written language as a graphic representation of the spoken. Fries (1963), expressing ideas typical of this psychological / linguistic theory explained the reading process as one of learning the grapheme-phoneme correspondences which would allow the reader to recode the visual representation.

As more cognitively-oriented theories of reading became expounded, people began to accept reading as a cognitive activity. It was no longer considered to be merely a graphic decoding/encoding process but as a very active decoding through a series of thought processes. Smith (1971) explained the L1 reading process in his feature-analytic model as one in which the fluent reader decodes directly from the visual representation to meaning. When difficult

---

* Presented at the Colloque international sur l'acquisition d'une langue étrangère: perspectives de recherche, Université de Paris-Vincennes, April, 1979.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Philip C. Hauptman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

elements are encountered, the reader changes his strategy from immediate identification of elements to a mediated identification process in which he breaks down the unfamiliar element for analysis.

Goodman (1967, 1968, 1969) also sees the reader as decoding directly from the graphic representation. Goodman goes on to explain that the reading process is basically one of hypothesis-formation. As the reader scans a passage, he forms an initial hypothesis based on what he sees as he begins. As he progresses through the selection, he uses various cues : graphic, syntactic, and semantic to help him accept, refine or reject his initial hypothesis. If the last occurs, he will generally go back and re-read the passage and reform his hypothesis which will then be subject to further acceptance, refinement or rejection.

The use of the cues, in Goodman's theory is crucial to help the reader decode and predict what is to come. Moreover, his knowledge of the cues helps him make educated guesses about the function and meaning of unfamiliar elements.

Most of the research in reading has been in L1 reading. Reading in L2, according to structuralist theory, as in L1, was regarded as a passive skill and secondary to speaking. For this reason, reading was usually not taught, in a L2 programme, until after the student had attained a certain proficiency in the speaking skill.

However, with recent cognitive developments in L1 reading, there have been attempts to apply these cognitive theories to L2 reading. Most of the attempts have centered around the use of the various types of cues. Hatch, Polin, and Part (1970) compared L1 and L2 reading and found that L1 English speaking students paid less attention to function words than L2 (ESL) students. Hauptman (1976) found that students of high, intermediate and low proficiencies in ESL had less difficulty with syntactic cues and more difficulty with semantic cues. Similarly, Cziko (1977) found that students of all proficiencies in French as a second language (FSL) were able to use syntactic constraints in a text and that semantic and discourse constraints were used only by francophones and the highest-proficiency L2 students. These findings seem to be corroborated in a study by Hosenfeld (1977) who found that good L2 readers (in French, Spanish and German) were able to use more global information than poor L2 students. Finally, a study by Ulijn (1978) showed that L2 reading in FSL led to more lexical than syntactic misinterpretations.

Many questions arise from the literature cited. the above research suggests that lower-level proficiency L2 readers seem to use syntactic cues more than semantic cues and that as proficiency increases, so does the use of semantic cues increase. Following this lead, it would be interesting to investigate if similar results would appear in other studies. Furthermore, if certain cues seemed to be

more widely used at particular levels of proficiency, it should be worthwhile to try and determine why these cues are important.

There is a comparative dearth of research comparing L1 and L2 reading strategies. In general, however, studies seem to confirm guesses that L1 and L2 strategies appear to differ at lower levels, and that the L2 strategies approach those of L1 with increase in L2 proficiency (Lapkin and Swain 1977; Oller, et al. 1972).

In an attempt to help answer some of the questions concerning the roles of syntactic vs. semantic cues and the similarities and/or differences between L1 and L2 reading strategies, a pilot study was conducted with 47 English-speaking students enrolled in French as a Second Language classes at the University of Ottawa, a bilingual, English-French institution. The purpose of the study was two-fold: 1) to investigate the use of L2 cues at various proficiency levels and 2) to compare L1 and L2 reading strategies. In the first case, it was desired to see if students use syntactic and semantic cues equally at different proficiency levels in L2 and to try to determine how, why, and under what conditions they use these cues. In the second case, the study was to see if there were any differences or similarities in the use of syntactic and semantic cues between L1 and L2 reading tasks. Finally, it was investigated to determine if the similarities or differences were a function of the L2 proficiency.

1.2 Cloze Procedure

The method chosen to elicit information for this study was the cloze procedure. The cloze procedure is one in which lexical items are deleted at a particular frequency interval in a selected text and replaced with blanks of uniform length. The student is required to restore the text by filling in the blanks. Research has shown this procedure to correlate very highly with standardized proficiency tests, thus serving as a valid and reliable instrument for measuring L2 proficiency (Brière, et al. 1978; Darnell 1970; Oller 1972; Oller 1973; Stubbs and Tucker 1974; and Swain, et al. 1976). Furthermore, it has been found that the cloze procedure is probably one of the most valid and reliable instruments for measuring reading comprehension (Anderson 1976; Chihara, et al. 1977; Jongsma 1971; McLeod and Anderson 1970).

The theoretical justification for the use of the cloze procedure centers on the theoretical belief of what is the underlying basis of language skills. Oller (1972: 151) suggests that "....the foundation of all language skills is the capacity to anticipate elements in sequence." Since one's expectancy ability is most likely the basis of both proficiency (Aitken 1977; Darnell 1970) and reading (Oller 1973), it is not strange that an instrument which measures this expectancy would be measuring both general proficiency and reading in L2.

2.0 Method

2.1 Texts

Two general-interest French texts were selected (one of 292 words and one of 345 words) from Dialogue Canada I (published by the Public Service Commission of Canada) to serve as the 22 texts. Both texts were of approximate equivalent difficulty; one came from unit 41 and the other from unit 42 of the students' book of readings. A further verification of equivalence which was performed will be discussed below. Each text was prepared as a cloze test in the following way. As is common procedure, approximately two sentences at the beginning and at the end of each text were left intact to help the students orient themselves contextually. Then, every seventh word was eliminated and replaced by a blank of uniform length. The only exception was monosyllabic words whose final e is normally dropped before vowels (i.e. le, ce, ne, de becoming l', c', n', d'). The frequency interval of every seventh item is generally recognized as best for these purposes (Aitken 1977; Oller 1972).

To prepare texts for L1 (English) the French texts were translated, previous research having shown that a careful translation of texts would yield cloze tests of equivalent difficulty (Oller, et al. 1972).

2.2 Subjects

The subjects chosen for the study (3 groups) were anglophone students in intermediate and advanced French classes at the University

of Ottawa. Subjects in groups 1 and 3 were in first year French and at approximately the same proficiency level (intermediate) according to the results of the proficiency test (Laval University French proficiency test) administered at the beginning of the year for placement purposes. Students in Group 2 were in a second year class and were at a more advanced level. Groups 1 & 2 (N's of 12 and 18 respectively) were chosen to be L2 groups, those reading texts only in French, and Group 3 was the L1/L2 group, in which the subjects read one English and one French text.

2.3 Tests

Each test booklet for all students contained a page of instructions followed by two cloze tests. The instructions, in both English and French, explained the cloze procedure and gave examples of sample items. The instructions specified that the students were to try to decide on the missing element but if they could not make a reasonable guess, they were to provide any relevant information they knew, i.e. the part of speech or any semantic features. The order of the passages as first and second was counterbalanced so that about half of the students had booklets with Text A first, and half read Test P first.

Students in Groups 1 and 2 (the L2 only groups) received two French cloze tests: Text A and Text P. Students in Group 3 (the L1/L2 group) received one French and one English cloze test of different passages. So, if a student received Text A in French, he

received Text P in English. Therefore, four different but equivalent text forms were used. Text A-French (with 40 blanks), Text P-French (with 33 blanks), Text A-English (with 40 blanks), and Text P-English (with 31 blanks).

2.4 Administration and Correction of Tests

Students were given tests with an explanation of the directions and procedure. The students were also advised to read over the text once to get a general idea and then to go back and restore the texts. There was no time limit, but they were told to work as quickly as possible. In fact, all students finished in 30-40 minutes.

All tests were corrected in two ways: by exact replacement (ER) and by appropriate replacement (AR). The ER, correction required the exact missing word to be replaced, this was a binary, correct/incorrect correction, although simple misspellings were accepted as correct answers. The ER scores served as a proficiency measure. In the AR correction, which served as the basis for the analysis of the errors, any response that did not change the overall meaning of the passage and that did not produce a totally deviant structure was accepted. In this correction, misspellings, some English forms similar to French, number and gender errors were also accepted. Verb agreement and tense concordance errors were not accepted. In the final tabulation, errors were classified in the following categories: syntactic, semantic, both syntactic and semantic, and no response (a blank). A syntactic error was one in which there was an

apparent incorrect use of syntactic textual cues causing a violation of grammatical constraints. Types of errors classified as syntactic together with examples are listed below:

Type of syntactic error	Example of unaccepted responses in Text PF	
	response	blank no.
1. General violation of grammatical constraints.	vers	13
2. Wrong part of speech leading to a violation of grammatical constraints.	à	24
3. Incorrect preposition after verb.	dans	4
4. Incorrect morphology.	a'lume	17
5. Incorrect spellings due to a homophonous error.	ont	21

A semantic error was one in which the reader apparently failed to use or incorrectly used semantic cues in a text -- either local or global cues. Classified under the rubrique of semantic errors is:

1.	Missuse of global cues producing responses inconsistent with the context.	mal vue	24 14
2.	Wrong choice of lexical item but apparent knowledge of syntactic features of the item.	avançait	17
3.	Ignorance of lexical item but apparent knowledge of syntactic features of the item.	"nom"	6

Some errors were classified as both syntactic and semantic. For example, No. 17, installer is erroneous syntactically because of the

incorrect morphology, the use of the infinitive instead of the imperfect ending; moreover it is incorrect sematically in the context.

3.0 Results

3.1 Quantitative Results: L2-ONLY TESTS

Means and standard deviations were computed for the ER correction for each cloze test for each group. These results are shown in Table 1.

Correlations were performed between the ER corrections of Texts A and P, and coefficients significant at the .01 level were found, thus giving further support to the equivalence of the texts.

It was decided that since the two texts seemed to both measure similar abilities, and to facilitate the task of analysing the data, Text P only would be used for analysis of the L2-only groups (Groups 1 and 2). The results from both texts, however, would be used for the qualitative analysis of the L1 versions.

Syntactic errors, semantic errors, syntactic/semantic errors, and blanks were tabulated for each group. These totals are shown in Table 2.

Since analysis of variance of the ER scores and error type and χ^2 analysis of the group and the error type failed to show any significant differences, another view of the data was necessary to

help explain obvious differences observed in the data. Students were then divided into the following sub-groups based on their AR performance: sub-group A: those who had a difference of at least two more syntactic errors than semantic, sub-group B: those who had a difference of at least two more semantic errors than syntactic, sub-group C: those who had the same number, plus or minus one, of syntactic and semantic errors, and sub-group D: those who had more then two blanks (there was no overlap between sub-group D and any of the other groups). These results are shown in Table 3.

A χ^2 (4 x 4) analysis of sub-groups A, B, C, D and the 4 types of errors was performed. A significant χ^2 showed that there were in fact, distinctive groups among the students (χ^2, 9 df=64.43 $p < .001$). Another 2 x 4 χ^2 analysis of sub-groups A, B, C, D and just syntactic and semantic errors showed that these groups were different regarding semantic and syntactic errors (χ^2, 3 df= 18.09 $p < .001$). To isolate where differences occur three 2 x 2 χ^2 analyses were performed with regard to syntactic and semantic errors between: a) sub-groups A and B, b) B and C, c) A and C. The results of each analysis were significant. The results for a (sub-groups A and B) showed that the sub-groups did differ in terms of the number of syntactic and semantic errors (χ^2, 1 df=14.40 (with yates' correction) $p < .001$) the b analysis, which compared the semantic error sub-group with the equal syntactic/semantic sub-groups in terms of syntactic and semantic errors, showed that the semantic error sub-group (sub-group B) is actually a distinct sub-group (χ^2, 1 df=7.88 $p < .01$). The last χ^2

Table 1

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF GROUP FOR EACH TEXT

		FRENCH						ENGLISH	
		AF			PF			AE	PE
Correction	Texts Groups	1 (N=12)	2 (N=18)	3 (N=9)	1 (N=12)	2 (N=18)	3 (N=8)	3 (N=8)	3 (N=9)
ER	$\bar{X}$	21.91	23.22	21.33	17.25	19.61	15.12	27.75	21.22
	S.D.	3.36	2.83	3.50	2.37	2.27	3.48	3.53	2.53
AR	$\bar{X}$	28.83	30.00	27.11	25.41	26.16	20.25	35.00	27.33
	S.D.	2.58	2.70	5.30	3.94	1.79	4.94	3.58	2.91

Table 2

ERROR TYPES FOR EACH GROUP IN EACH CLOZE TEST

	PF		Group 3			
	Grp 1 N=12	Grp 2 N=18	PF N=8	AF N=9	PE N=9	AE N=8
Syn Errors	26	27	35	35	11	10
Sem Errors	19	51	40	31	12	26
Syn/Sem Errors	3	0	2	0	0	3
Blanks	9	10	9	14	3	2

Table 3

ERROR SUB-GROUPS FOR FIRST AND SECOND-YEAR CLASSES FOR CLOZE TEST PF

	Total Syn Errors	Total Sem Errors	Total Syn/Sem Errors	Total Blanks
S-GRP.A (N=3) (more syn)	14	4	0	3
S-GRP.B (N=13) (more sem)	13	41	0	4
S-GRP.C (N=12) (Equal syn & sem)	24	23	3	3
S-GRP.D (N=2) (more than 2 blanks)	2	2	0	9
TOTALS N=30	53	70	3	19

analysis, c, likewise showed the syntactic sub-group to be distinctive, but perhaps to a lesser degree (χ^2, 1 df=2.80 (with yates' correction) $p < .10$).

Further two-by-two χ^2 analyses revealed that Groups 1 and 2 (the first year and second year classes) differed with respect to a) syntactic errors and semantic errors (χ^2, 1 df=9.60 $p < .01$), and b) high syntactic error people (sub-group A) and high semantic error people (sub-group B). Thus, again it is evident that there are distinctive sub-groups of people making syntactic errors and semantic errors within different proficiency levels. A 2 x 2 χ^2 analysis between first and second year classes vs. syntactic errors and all other errors showed that the more advanced the course was, the fewer syntactic erros were committed (χ^2, 1 df=8.33 $p < .01$). Another similar analysis between French grade level and semantic errors/all other errors revealed that the higher the grade level in French, the more semantic errors were committed (χ^2, 1 df=10.86 $p < .001$).

Finally, an analysis of variance was performed to test for interaction betwen sub-groups A, B, C, D and the ER score on Text P. An interaction was found (F, df 3,29 = 2.93 $p < .05$). A Scheffé was done on all combinations of pairs and only sub-groups A and B were found to be significantly different ($p < .01$), showing that the syntactic-error sub-group consisted of lower proficiency students and the semantic-error sub-group was mainly students of higher proficiency.

3.2 Qualitative Results: L2-ONLY Tests

An analysis of the errors for each of the groups revealed an apparent difference in strategies between groups 1 and 2. In determining possible causes of errors, three predominant unsuccessful strategies seem to emerge: 1) reluctance to take chances, 2) failure to notice global cues, and 3) failure to notice local cues.

3.2.1. Reluctance to take chances

A large number of blanks by student in Group 1 indicates that rather than take the chance of putting down an answer for which they were undoubtedly not certain, they preferred to take the so-called "easy way out". Group 2 students seemed to prefer not leaving blanks. This was especially apparent in items 3 and 32.

3.2.2. Failure to notice global cues

Group 1 students demonstrated more frequent failure to notice and/or use global cues in the text than Group 2 students. This was apparent in item 12, for example, where more people in Group 1 failed to notice that this was the subject of the sentence and supplied qui. The other examples in this category were ones of incorrect verb tense use in items 17 and 20. In these items, Group 1 students had more errors, thus showing they had not made use of the larger context, answering in the present instead of the imperfect. In item 21 some Group 1 students supplied il showing they had missed global information which did not have a referent for the definite pronoun.

There were two items, 8 and 13, where Group 2 students made proportionately a few more global errors than Group 1 students. Why Group 1 should have done comparatively better in using the global cues necessary to answer this item is entirely open to speculation.

3.2.3. Failure to notice Local Cues

This unsuccessful strategy was observed by both groups but was manifested differently for each group. Group 1 students showed more errors of the syntactic type and Group 2 of the semantic type. In items 6, and 28 more people in Group 1 demonstrated a lack of syntactic knowledge and/or a failure to use the local syntactic information. In items 14 and 31, the errors, although not truly global, were all semantic for Group 2. Group 1 had no errors for 14 and one syntactic and one semantic for 31.

3.3 Results for Group 3 (English and French)

In an attempt to compare the English and French results, a second measure of proficiency was obtained for each student since all students had not read the same French text. Final course grades were obtained for the students and the teacher made an adjustment for any grades that did not reflect the students proficiency, as in the case of students who, for example were quite proficient in French but had not completed all the work, or those students who had made a great deal of improvement and had a good grade but were not necessarily very proficient. Thus, the adjusted grades used were judged to be a reflection of the students' proficiencies in French.

A correlation was performed between the above proficiency scores and 1) the difference between the number of syntactic errors and 2) the difference between the number of semantic errors on the French and English tests. A significant r ($r = -.48$ $p < .05$) was obtained for the former (but not the latter) indicating that as students improved in French, their number of syntactic errors decreased, approaching the status of the few number of syntactic errors in English. This was not the case with semantic errors, which did not negatively correlate with French proficiency and which were committed, nonetheless in English. A correlation was performed between semantic errors in English and French and found to be significant ($r = .51$ $p < .05$) indicating that those who committed many semantic errors in French also committed a larger number in English. Again, this was not related to the students' proficiency in French.

An analysis of the errors for each student revealed that English errors also demonstrated unsuccessful strategies similar to those found in French. Students who left blanks in French also tended to leave blanks in English (generally those students of lower French proficiency), indicating that if they are unwilling to take chances in French, they are generally unwilling to do so in English.

A parallel group of students who were less likely to make use of global cues was also revealed. Examples of this tendency can be seen in the following English errors by one student in cloze test AE. Item 19 was restored with boat, item 26 with invent and item 32

with then. Each of these responses violates the general context of the passage. This student also had a large number of errors due to lack of attention to global cues in the corresponding French text, PF.

Failure to make use of local cues in the English text produced syntactic errors more frequently than semantic errors. For example responses in items such as No. 2 with it's or No. 30 with say show that the general meaning was probably perceived but that the forms produced were grammatically unacceptable. There did not seem to be any parallel trend to this strategy in the corresponding French text. It is very difficult to explain how a native speaker of English could have produced forms which are grammatically unacceptable. One reasonable explanation is that while working quickly, the reader was not concerned with the syntax as long as the form did not violate any semantic criteria, i.e. as long as it did not alter the meaning. In short, only the first two unsuccessful strategies seem to be parallel in both languages. The third does not. Since Group 3 is quite close to Group 1 in terms of L2 proficiency, it could be expected that similar results would have been obtained by Group 1 if they had taken one of the English tests.

4.0 Conclusions

4.1 General Conclusions

Two types of conclusions emerge from this type of study. The first, general type of conclusion concerns the methodology used

in this study:

1) This study corroborates previous work in the use of cloze procedure. It seems that cloze is a valid instrument for measuring and studying reading strategies in both first and second language.

2) This study found that equivalent bilingual forms of a text can be arrived at through translation of texts.

4.2 Second Language Conclusions

The study specifically revealed a number of tendencies worth noting:

1) A normal population of L2 students will probably reveal distinctive groups of students who make more syntactic errors or who make more semantic errors.

2) Generally, as students progress in L2, their L2 syntax improves and they make progressively fewer syntactic errors. This, of course, is not surprising.

3) Conversely, as students' L2 proficiency improves, they make more semantic errors. This, of course is more difficult to explain and seems to differ from previous research. It is possible that as students improve in L2, they become correspondingly more willing to take a chance. If this is true, it is a positive L2 reading strategy. Since Goodman's theory is based on hypothesis-formation, it follows that anything which favours this strategy is positive.

4) Lower proficiency L2 students are more relunctant to take chances than higher proficiency L2 students.

5) Possibly one of the most important strategies revealed is that lower proficiency L2 students are less able to use global textual information than more proficient L2 students. It is knowledge of global cues which probably marks the advanced student most readily.

6) The fact that lower proficiency L2 students seem to missuse more syntactic local cues corroborates No. 3 above. The fact that more advanced students appear to missuse semantic local cues more is likewise, consistent with No. 4.

4.3 First Language — Second Language Conclusions

1) Students who have difficulty with L2 semantic information tend to have difficulty with semantic information in L1.

2) A student's ability to read in both languages is not perceived to be strongly related to L2 proficiency.

3) The unsuccessful L2 strategy of reluctance to take a chance seems to be paralleled in L1.

4) The ability or inability to use global cues in L2 seems to be paralleled in L1.

This present study was a pilot study to investigate first and second language reading strategies. Obviously, the generalizability of a small study is always open to question. Nevertheless, it is believed that through a number of small studies such as this one, insight into reading can best be achieved.

REFERENCES

Aitken, Kenneth G. "Using Cloze Procedure as an Overall Language Proficiency Test." TESOL Quaterly, 11/1, March, 1977, 59-67.

Anderson, Jonathan Psycholinguistic Experiments in Foreign Language Testing. St. Lucia, Queensland, Australia: University of Queensland Press, 1976.

Brière, Eugène J., Gerhard Clausing, Donna Senko and Edward Purcell. "A look at Cloze Testing Across Languages and Levels." Modern Language Journal, 62/1-2, Jan.-Feb., 1978, 23-26.

Chihara, Tetsuro, John Oller, Kelley Weaver, and Mary Anne Chavez-Oller. "Are Cloze Items Sensitive to Constraints Across Sentences?" Language Learning, Vol. 27, No. 1, June, 1977.

Cziko, Gary A. "Differences in First and Second Language Reading: The Use of Syntactic, Semantic, and Discourse Constraints." Paper presented at the Conference on Second Language Learning, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, September, 1977.

Darnell, Donald K. "Clozentropy: A Procedure for Testing English Language Proficiency of Foreign Students." Speech Monographs, 37, 1970, 36-46.

Downie, N.M. and R.W. Heath Basic Statistical Methods, Third Edition. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970.

Goodman, Kenneth S. "Analysis of Oral Reading Miscues." Reading Research Quaterly, 5/1, 1969, 9-30. Reprinted in F. Smith, ed. Psycholinguistics and Reading. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Goodman, Kenneth S. "The Psycholinguistic Nature of the Reading Process." in K.S. Goodman, ed. The Psycholinguistic Nature of the Reading Process. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1968.

Goodman, Kenneth S. "Reading: A Psycholinguistic Guessing Game." in H. Singer and R.B. Ruddell, eds. Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association, 1970.

Hatch, Evelyn, Pam Polin and Susan Part. "Acoustic Scanning and Syntactic Processing: Three Experiments - First and Second Language Learners." Journal of Reading Behavior, Vol. 6, 1974.

Hauptman, Philip C. "The Use of Cues in Reading English as a Second Language." Paper presented at Colloquium on Second Language Reading at the 1976 TESOL Convention, New York, March, 1976.

Hosenfeld, Carol. "A Preliminary Investigation of the Reading Strategies of Successful and Nonsuccessful Second Language Learners." System, 5/2, May, 1977, 110-123.

Lapkin, Sharon and Merrill Swain "The Use of English and French Cloze Tests in a Bilingual Education Program Evaluation: Validity and Error Analysis." Language Learning, 27/2, Dec., 1977, 279-314.

McLeod, John and Jonathan Anderson. "An Approach to Assessment of Reading Ability through Information Transmission." Journal of Reading Behavior, Vol. 2, 1970.

Oller, John W. Jr. "Cloze Tests of Second Language Proficiency and What They Measure." Language Learning, 23/1, June, 1973, 105-118.

Oller, John W., Jr. "Scoring Methods and Difficulty Levels for Cloze Tests of Proficiency in English as a Second Language." Modern Language Journal, 56/3, March, 1972, 151-158.

Oller, John W. Jr., J. Donald Bowen, Ton That Dien, and Victor W. Mason. "Cloze Tests in English, Thai, and Vietnamese: Native and Non-Native Performance." Language Learning, Vol. 22, No.1,

Public Service Commission of Canada Dialogue Canada I, Niveau élémentaire, Elève. Ottawa: Commission de la fonction publique du Canada, 1974.

Stubbs, Joseph Bartow and G. Richard Tucker. "The Cloze Test as a Measure of English Proficiency." Modern Language Journal, Vol. 58, Nos. 5-6, Sept.-Oct., 1974.

Swain, Merrill, Sharon Lapkin and Henri C. Barik. "The Close Test as a Measure of Second Language Proficiency for Young Children." Working Papers on Bilingualism, No. 11, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, August, 1976.

Ulijn, J.M. "A Dutch Project in Second Language Reading Comprehension for Vocational Purposes." Presented at 1978 AILA Conference, Montreal, Quebec, August, 1978.

Directions:

1. You will have two texts to read: one in English and one in French. In each text, some of the words have been removed. You are to fill in each blank with what YOU BELIEVE is the correct word. Be sure you use only ONE WORD.

   Example: The man ran down the street as _____ as he could. As he ran, he _____ over his shoulder and saw that _____ car was getting closer and _____.

   The correct answer for Nr. 1 was fast. However you might have used another word with about the same meaning, such as quickly or rapidly. The correct answer to Nr. 2 was looked or even glanced. The correct answer to Nr. 3 could be the or a and for Nr. 4 it is closer.

2. If you are not at all able to figure out the word, but you do know SOMETHING ABOUT the word, write what you do know.

   Example: He took the train to _____.

   You might not know the word, but you do probably know that it is'a place name'.

   In other examples you might put "noun", "verb", "adjective", "motion word" or even "something to do with trains, stores, etc."

3. When you begin, first try to read through the text just to get the general meaning. Then, re-read the text and try to fill in the blanks.

4. After each text are comprehension questions based on the text. Please answer these questions WITHOUT looking back at the text.

The French version of the instructions has been omitted (Editors).

Nom _____

Remplissez les espaces blancs avec les mots qui paraissent appropriés.

N.B. Un seul mot par espace.

Non, l'eau ne me vient pas à la bouche quand j'entends une clochette, mais je me suis rendu compte l'autre jour à quel point nous avons des réflexes conditionnés! J'ai toujours dîné à sept heures. Souvent, la télévision était allumée à ce (1) moment-là et je la regardais plus (2) ou moins distraitement. C'était d'ailleurs (3) toujours la même émission qui passait à (4) cette heure là. Pourtant, l'autre jour (5), on a changé l'horaire; l'émission (6) passe maintenant une heure plus tôt. Eh (7) bien, croyez-le ou non, la première (8) fois que je l'ai regardée à (9) la nouvelle heure j'ai senti que (10) j'avais faim.

Il y a quelques (11) années, à l'émission "Candid Camera" on (12) a installé des feux de circulation au-dessus (13) d'un trottoir, loin de toute intersection (14)! Il n'y avait aucune raison de (15) s'arrêter à cet endroit et pourtant (16), dès que le feu rouge s'allumait (17), les piétons s'arrêtaient et attendaient le (18) feu vert. Certains restaient sérieux, d'autres (19) souriaient un peu, mais personne ne passait (20), quand le feu était rouge.

Habituellement, on (21) peut vivre sans trop de problèmes avec (22) ses réflexes conditionnés. Il faut cependant faire (23) attention, parce que ces réflexes peuvent parfois (24) influencer notre façon de penser ou de (25) juger. On a constaté par exemple, qu'un (26) boxeur qui porte un maillot blanc a (27) plus de faveur des juges que celui (28) qui porte un maillot noir. Inconsciemment, les (29) juges semblent prendre le maillot blanc pour (30) un

symbole d'innocence. Dans un demaine (31) plus sérieux, combien de gens associent l'honnêteté (32) et la gentillesse à des cheveux courts (33) ou à un menton rasé!

Nous ne pouvons certe pas éliminer nos réflexes conditionnés; cependant, je crois que nous pouvons souvent les dominer. Evidemment certains sont très résistants... Depuis trois jours, je dîne à six heures...

NAME _____

Fill in the blanks with the words you believe to be correct. Remember:

ONLY ONE WORD IN EACH BLANK.

No, I do not salivate whenever I hear a bell, but I realized the other day to what point we have conditioned reflexes. I have always eaten dinner at seven o'clock. Often, the televison was on during dinner (4) and I watched it more or less (8) inattentively. Moreover, it was always the same (12) program that was on at this time (16). However, the other day, the schedule changed (20); the program is on one hour earlier (24) now. All right, believe it or not (28), the first time I watched it at (32) the new time, I felt hungry.

A (36) few years ago, on "Candid Camera" they (40) installed a traffic light over a sidewalk (44), far from any intersection! There was no (48) reason to stop at this spot; however (52), whenever the light turned red, the pedestrians (56) stopped and waited for the green light (60). Some remained serious, others smiled a little (64), but no one went on when the (68) light was red.

Generally, we can live (72) our lives without too many problems with (76) our conditioned reflexes. We have to be (80) careful because these reflexes can sometimes influence (84) our way of thinking or judging. It (88) has been pointed out, for example, that (92) a boxer who wears white trunks is (96) better liked by the judges than one (100) who wears black trunks. Unconsciously, the judges (104) seem to consider the white trunks as (108) symbol of innocence. In a more serious (112) area, how many people associate honesty and (116) niceness with short hair and a shaven (120) face!

We can certainly not eliminate our (124) conditioned reflexes. However, I believe we can often dominate them. Apprently, some are very resistant... For three days I have been eating at six o'clock...

NAME _____

Fill in the blanks with the words you believe to be correct. Remember: ONLY ONE WORD IN EACH BLANK.

Some get seasick, other airsick; me, I get elevator-sick. It is funny that this means of transportation is called an elevator: isn't it used just as much to go down as to go up? I never get in this dangerous box(1) without apprehension; I am always sure it(2) is going to stop between two floors(3).

An elevator is like life: a little(4) something between two nothings. When the door(5) disappears into the wall and I see(6) in front of me this little beeth(7) which wants to swallow me, I realize(8) that below this booth there is absolutely(9) nothing. Going up in an elevator is(10) like coming into the world: you are(11) between two eternities.

But, you will tell(12) me, there are cables which hold the(13) elevator up and a good electric motor(14) which moves it. I agree completely. But(15) those cables ... have you ever seen them(16)? They are carefully hidden in order to(17) give you a false sense of security(18). Have you ever been in an elevator(19) with a glass floor? Imagine for a(20) moment that you are getting in this(21) type of elevator on the twentieth floor(22) of a building: all of a sudden(23) you see an abyss beneath you of(24) three hundred feet. How can you not(25) be afraid? Nonetheless, every day, people enter(26) these diabolical machines laughing. There is no(27) doubt: man can become accustomed to anything(28).

Definitely no ... I do not like elevators(29). When the elevator door closes, I tell(30) myself, "That's it." This time, we are(31) going to crash into the basement, or(32) we are going to get stuck between(33) floors. But each time, it's a new(34) miracle: we arrive at the expected floor(35), the door opens, and I start to(36) breathe again. Without a doubt, there is(37) an excellent psychological explanation for this phenomenon(38), but I do not want to know(39) it. I hate people who try to(40) escape reality by finding a vague psychological explanation for everything. For me, there's only one truth: an elevator is dangerous. Besides, going up and down the stairs is much better for your health...